

UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Tracemark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATÜ	ONUND39, FERING DATES/25/	SE ERST, NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
			L 044000.001
	P. 04	QM31/0828	

H. DALE LANGLEY JR
AKIN GROUP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
816 CONGRESS AVENUE
SUITE 1900
AUSTIN TX 78701

EXAMINER WINGOOD, P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

08/28/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	09/139858	(C.B	RAUD.	// /		
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Group Art Unit			
	WINGOO	20	3/36			
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet be	eneath the co	rrespondence ac	ldress-		
Period for Reply	_					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO I	EXPIRE	MONTH(S)	FROM THE MAIL	ING DATE		
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expected to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, 	within the statutory minimu	ım of thirty (30) d the mailing date	lays will be considere	d timely.		
Status						
Thesponsive to communication(s) filed on	16,00					
☐ This action is FINAL.				•		
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C 	formal matters, prose C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.	cution as to t	he merits is clos	ed in		
Disposition of Claims						
Detaim(s)1-4, 11-22		is/are pe	ending in the appl	ication.		
Of the above claim(s)		is/ara w	ithdrawn from com	sideration.		
©-Claim(s)//-/_3		is/are al	lowed.			
		is/are re	jected.			
□ Claim(s)		is/are ob	jected to.			
□ Claim(s)				r election		
Application Papers		requiren				
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing R	eview, PTO-948.		•			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.						
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	to by the Examiner.					
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)						
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the □ received. 	35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(c priority documents hav	i). ve been				
 received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)_ received in this national stage application from the Internal 	tional Bureau (PCT Ru	ıle 1 7.2(a)).	<u> </u>			
*Certified copies not received:			·			
Attachment(s)						
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)	□ Inte	erview Summa	ry, PTO-413			
☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		□ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948		☐ Other				

Office Action Summary

U. S. Patient and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No.

Application/Control Number: 09/139, 858

Art Unit: 3301

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner notes Applicant's election of Species II, accordingly, Species I is withdrawn from consideration and the election is here made final.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CAR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CAR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CAR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-2, 3, 4 and 14-20, 21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-3, 4, 5 and 15-21 and 22 respectively of U. S. Patent No. 5,811,681 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a method of administering an audiometric test by controlling an audiometer, first switching the output and outputting representative sound, second switching the audiometer output to test tones, and they claim almost identical elements of the multimedia audiometer.

Application/Control Number: 09/139, 858

Page 3

Art Unit: 3301

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moser et al.

Moser discloses a laser audiometer having a basic audiometer (50), a computer (60), a multimedia input interface (62,64) and a communications interface (68,70) and a speaker at (58).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 11-13 are allowed.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 09/139, 858 Page 4

Art Unit: 3301

7. Shennib et al.(5,645,074) discloses a hearing evaluation and hearing aid system to compute the

electroacoustic parameters of a haring aid.

6. Meyer-Bisch (5,239,872) discloses an apparatus for measuring the sensitivity of a subject to

vibration by locating an individuals perception threshold.

7. Cohen et al. (5,023,783) discloses an evoked response audiometer for sleeping patients and

means for analyzing brain potentials.

NOTE: The drawings were not objected to. The PTO-948 was sent to the incorrect address in

the earlier mailing.

Any questions related to this application can be addressed to Pamela Wingood who can be

reached on (703)308-2676.

amela Wingood

Patent Examiner

July 26, 2000

CARÝO'CONNOR

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINES

GROUP 3700